

Attachment D

Conditions of Approval

ATTACHMENT D

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL TENTATIVE TRACT MAP 16323

All applicable provisions and requirements of City Codes and Ordinances shall be met for this project. All conditions unless otherwise specifies are due prior to the issuance of building permits. The following specific requirements shall also apply:

1. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

- 1.1 Within two years of this approval, the Tentative Tract Map shall be exercised or the permit/approval shall become null and void. These subdivisions shall be granted an extension of time for up to the ten (10) year term of the Development Agreement.
- 1.2 In the event that this approval is legally challenged, the City will promptly notify the applicant of any claim or action and will cooperate fully in the defense of the matter. Once notified, the applicant agrees to defend, indemnify, and hold harmless the City, its officers, agents and employees from any claim, action or proceeding against the City of Loma Linda. The applicant further agrees to reimburse the City of any costs and attorneys' fees, which the City may be required by a court to pay as a result of such action, but such participation shall not relieve applicant of his or her obligation under this condition.
- 1.3 The proposed small lot subdivision shall conform to all provisions of Title 16 of the Loma Linda Municipal Code (LLMC).
- 1.4 The applicant shall submit an application for Precise Plan of Design for the housing product, landscaping and all site amenities for review and approval by the Planning Commission. Planning Commission approval is required prior to issuance of all permits with the exception of Rough Grading.
- 1.5 Architectural styles shall be a variety of styles as provided in the Mission District Historic Overlay Ordinance, LLMC, Chapter 17.82.
- 1.6 All of the items specified in the Development Agreement shall be made conditions of this project.
- 1.7 All fencing around the yard areas shall be installed with the houses and shall be illustrated on the final landscape plan.
- 1.8 Mitigation measures listed in the Mitigated Negative Declaration shall be made conditions of this project.

- 1.9 As part of the Precise Plan of Design process, the applicant shall submit proposed street names to the Community Development Department for review by the Historical Commission and the approval of the City Council pursuant to the City of Loma Linda Park and Facilities Names Policy Procedure.
- 1.10 The project and future development and/or improvements shall conform to the approved Mission Lane Planned Community Document.
- 1.11 The developer shall provide infrastructure for the Loma Linda Connected Community Program, which includes providing a technologically enabled development that includes coaxial, cable, and fiber optic lines to all outlets in each unit of the development. Plans for the location of the infrastructure shall be provided with the precise grading plans and reviewed and approved by the City of Loma Linda prior to issuing grading permits.
- 1.12 No on-street parking shall be permitted on street G. Parking shall only be permitted on one side of streets D, E, F, H and the one-way portion of C as specified at time of plan check review, in order to provide for the movement and turning radius of emergency vehicles and trash trucks.
- 1.13 The trash receptacle location and design shall be approved by the waste hauler company and written proof of the approval shall be provided to the Community Development Department prior to issuance of building permits.
- 1.14 The architectural amenities, materials and features shall be provided on the elevations of all four sides of the homes located on corner lots.
- 1.15 The conditions shall comply with the modifications made to Tentative Tract Map (TTM) No. 16323 submitted on May 5, 2004.

Noise

- 1.16 To mitigate for exterior/backyard noise levels, properties adjoining Mission Road and/or Van Leuven Street shall install a minimum six-foot high solid wall between the roadway and the back/side yards.
- 1.17 To mitigate for interior noise levels, properties adjoining Mission Road shall either construct a solid wall as described above, or be setback at least 35 feet from the edge of the roadway. If this mitigation is not feasible, an indoor noise analysis should be conducted for these homes when grading and architectural plans become available.

- 1.18 During construction of the site, the project shall comply with Section 9.20.050 (Prohibited Noises) of the Loma Linda Municipal Code, which requires that exterior construction activities and any interior construction activities that would effect exterior noise levels cease between the hours of 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.

Cultural Resources

- 1.19 Full-time monitoring by a licensed archeologist during all grubbing, grading, and utility trenching activities where intact soils below the upper 2 feet of grade are disturbed. Native American tribal monitors (from groups indicated by the NAHC) shall be hired by the project proponent and shall be on site during the grubbing, grading, and utility trenching phases of the project. These monitors shall also be on-site during any archaeological Phase 2 testing or Phase 3 (excavation) work.
- 1.20 If human remains be discovered during construction activities, all work in the area shall be suspended and the San Bernardino County Coroner shall be notified of the discovery. Work shall not resume until the Coroner has approved resumption of activities.
- 1.21 Testing of the ground up to 150 feet from the southern edge of Mission Road should take place at the north end of APN 0292-111-03 and -04 to ensure that no buried features associated with this specific site are impacted.
- 1.22 Should potentially significant buried cultural resources be uncovered during construction, such resources should be tested by a qualified archaeologist for historical significance prior to continuing construction or grading.
- 1.23 The barn structure, concrete foundation/platform east of the barn, and two concrete troughs located on site as part of the Van Uffelen Dairy (east of the SCE easement) shall be photographically recorded and records provided to the City of Loma Linda prior to issuance of grading permits.
- 1.24 The two concrete troughs located on site as part of the Van Uffelen Dairy shall be relocated into the Edison Easement and used as landscape features, only if the troughs can be moved without being damaged and can be used in a safe manner for the public.

2. PUBLIC SAFETY DEPARTMENT

- 2.1 All construction shall meet the requirements of the editions of the *Uniform Building Code* (UBC)/California Building Code (CBC) and the *Uniform Fire Code* (UFC)/California Fire Code (CFC) as adopted and amended by the City of Loma Linda and legally in effect at the time of issuance of building permit.

- 2.2 Pursuant to UBC Section 904.2.2, as amended in Loma Linda Municipal Code (LLMC) Section 15.08.240, and as further modified herein, all future buildings to be constructed within the area of the tract shall be equipped with fully automatic fire sprinkler systems meeting the requirements of National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) 13D. 13D Section 4-6 shall be modified so as to provide additional sprinkler coverage beyond that specified in the standard, e.g., in garages, attached porches, additional small rooms and concealed spaces, etc. (specific language will be provided at the time of plan review).
- 2.3 Pursuant to UFC Section 1001.3, plans and specifications for the fire sprinkler systems shall be submitted to Fire Prevention for review and approval prior to installation.
- 2.4 A utility improvement plan showing the proposed locations for fire hydrants shall be submitted to Fire Prevention for review and approval as part of the plan review process (may be done in conjunction with Public Works Engineering plan review).
- 2.5 Building addresses shall be as assigned by the Public Safety Department upon submittal of a working copy of the Final Tract Map.

3. PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT

- 3.1 Record a Final Map with the San Bernardino County Recorder pursuant to the provisions of the State Subdivision Map Act prior to issuance of all permits.
- 3.2 At the time of Final Tract Map submittal, include the following: Traverse calculations (sheets), copies of recorded maps and deeds used as reference and/or showing original land division, tie notes and bench marks referenced, and a current title report. The traverse calculation sheets to show error of closure. Inverse calculations will not be acceptable for plan check review.

Soils/Geology/Grading

- 3.3 Submit grading plans, preliminary soils report and hydrology/hydraulic study to the Public Works Department for review and approval. The precise grading plan for the project must be approved prior to issuance of any building permits. NPDES regulations apply. A copy of your approved SWPPP and NOI issued by the State Water Resources Control Board shall be submitted to the Public Works Department.

- 3.4 Submit and obtain Public Works Department approval of an erosion/sediment control plan to minimize potential increases in erosion and sediment transport during short term construction and long term operational activity prior to issuance of any grading or building permits.
- 3.5 Soil sampling and analysis of visibly stained soils will be conducted prior to any grading or earthmoving activities. Any soil that is determined to contain contaminants in hazardous concentrations will be properly treated and/or removed by a qualified hazardous waste company.
- 3.6 Dust control will be made a condition of the grading plans for this project.
- 3.7 Submit structural design and location for any required walls for review by the Building and Safety Department.
- 3.8 Submit geology report, prepared by a licensed engineering geologist, filed with and approved by the Public Works Department prior to recordation. Submit deposit to cover the costs of the review with the report. An additional deposit may be required or a refund issued when the costs do not match the deposit. Pay review costs in full prior to recordation of the Final Map.
- 3.9 Soil sampling and analysis of visibly stained soils will be conducted prior to any grading or earthmoving activities. Certification that this work has been completed by a licensed engineering geologist, filed with and approved by the Public Works Department, shall be provided prior to the issuance of any grading permits. Any soil that is determined to contain contaminants in hazardous concentrations will be properly treated and/or removed by a qualified hazardous waste company.
- 3.10 Submit original wet signed and stamped grading certifications from the soils engineer and the grading engineer, along with compaction reports to the Public Works Department.
- 3.11 The precise grading plan for the project must be approved by the Planning Commission as part of the Precise Plan of Design approval and also approved by the City of Loma Linda prior to issuance of any building permits.
- 3.12 Submit final grade certifications, by the grading engineer, to the Public Works Department prior to issuance of any Certificate of Occupancy.

Street Improvements

- 3.13 A traffic signal is proposed for the intersection of Mountain View at Mission Road to improve traffic flow under peak load conditions. A subdivision agreement between the project proponent and the City will be approved which provides for a proportionate assessment of costs for intersection improvements at Mountain View Avenue and Mission Road.
- 3.14 Install or bond for all off-site improvements prior to recording the final map.
- 3.15 A subdivision agreement is required and shall include the proportionate share for intersection improvements at Mountain View Avenue and Mission Road.
- 3.16 A subdivision agreement between the project proponent and the City will be approved which provides for proportionate assessment of costs for storm drain and street improvements required for Mission Road and the proposed parks. In lieu of paying park fees and the proportionate assessment of the storm drain improvement costs, as stated above, the project proponent may install parks, the storm drain required for Mission Road, and the required street improvements to the Mission Road right-of-way including the north travel lane adjacent to the project area within the City acquired right of way. A subdivision agreement between the project proponent and the City will be approved which provides for proportionate reimbursement of costs for the parks, storm drain, and street improvements installed by the project proponent.
- 3.17 Construct full street improvements (including, but not limited to curb and gutter, asphalt concrete pavement, aggregate base, sidewalk, one drive approach per lot, and street lights) on all interior streets. The widths of the right-of-way shall be as indicated in Condition 3.34 and as shown on the Tentative Tract Map No. 16323 date stamped May 5, 2004, and on file with the City of Loma Linda Community Development Department.
- 3.18 Corner cutoffs at all right-of-way lines in accordance with the City standards.
- 3.19 Street light locations are to be approved by the City of Loma Linda. Streetlights shall be installed and energized prior to release for occupancy for any houses. Streetlights shall be of the mission bell design and consistent with developments in the Mission Road historic overlay district.
- 3.20 Any streets damaged as a result of new services will be repaired as required by the Public Works Department.

- 3.21 Provide adequate corner sight distance per Caltrans standards at intersection and submit verification of same to the Public Works Department as required in conjunction with plan checking of the street improvement plans.
- 3.22 Install street name signs and traffic control signs with locations and types approved by the Public Works Department.
- 3.23 "Record Revisions" made to all plans to reflect the changes to the improvements as constructed.
- 3.24 Slurry seal prior to final bond release or a cash payment made in lieu of slurry seal, after all houses are constructed.
- 3.25 Sidewalks with parkways between the curb and the sidewalk shall be provided on both sides of Street A, D, portions of Street E, Van Leuven, and Pepper Way. Sidewalks with parkways between the curb and the sidewalk shall be provided on one side of Street C, D, F, H, and portions of Street E. Sidewalks are to be a minimum width of 5 feet in width (measured from the parkway) located adjacent to the right-of-way line. On one side of Street G a trail with a parkway between the curb and the sidewalk shall be provided. The trail shall be a width of six (6) feet and constructed of asphaltic concrete in an earth tone color.
- 3.26 Submit a thorough evaluation of the structural road section, from a qualified soil engineer, to the Public Works Department. Include a recommended street structural section, designed for a service life of 20 years as outlined in Section 600 of the Caltrans Highway Design Manual. The minimum section is 3-1/2" A.C./6" C.A.B. for local streets and 4" A.C./6" C.A.B. for collector streets. The Public Works Department will provide the traffic index.
- 3.27 Design public improvements including sidewalk, drive approaches and handicap ramps in accordance with all requirements of the State of California Accessibility Standards, Title 24 California Administrative Code.

Dedication

- 3.28 Public utility easements shall be dedicated to cover all utilities either by map or separate document.
- 3.29 Install street name signs and traffic control signs with locations and types approved by the Public Works Department.
- 3.30 Stripe and sign for bike lanes on roadways designated by the City for bike lanes.

- 3.31 "Record Revisions" shall be made to all plans to reflect the changes to the improvements as constructed.
- 3.32 Dedicate interior street rights-of-way and all necessary easements by Final Map or separate document.
- 3.33 Dedicate by Final Map or separate document of the following rights-of-way on the following streets:

| | | |
|---------|---|---|
| 29 | feet to centerline | <u>Interior Street A adjacent to lots 42-45 and 93-90</u> |
| 26 | feet to centerline | <u>Remainder of Interior Street A with a 50' radii</u> <u>turn around at the souther terminus.</u> |
| 16 | feet to centerline | <u>Interior Street B</u> |
| 16 & 25 | feet to centerline | <u>Interior Street C</u> |
| 25 | feet width right-of-way | <u>One Way Streets D*, E*, and F* with sidewalk</u> <u>on one side</u> |
| 43 | feet width right-of-way | <u>One Way Streets D* and E* with sidewalk</u> <u>on both sides</u> |
| 40 | feet to centerline | <u>Pepper Way</u> |
| 33-36 | feet to centerline | <u>Van Leuven Street</u> |
| 2 | feet to south side of Mission Road Right-of-Way | |
| 20 | feet on the east side of Pepper Way Right-of-Way, except for lot 97 | |
| 25 & 30 | feet to centerline | <u>Interior Street G</u> |

* Width of right-of-way varies as illustrated on Tentative Tract Map.

Note: Corner P/L radius or cutoff required on all street intersections.

Dedication by Final Map unless otherwise approved by the Public Works Department.

- 3.34 Vehicular access rights dedicated as follows: Mission Road with the exception of frontage adjacent to lots 94 and 95, Pepper Way with exception to frontage adjacent to lot 95, and Van Leuven Street
- 3.35 All lettered lots including parks, open space, areas to be landscaped in front of project boundary walls or fences, within traffic medians, along project street frontages and on major slopes annexed to the City's Landscape Maintenance District in accordance with City policy. The Homeowners Association will be responsible for maintenance of the areas within the tract.
- 3.36 Landscape Maintenance District annexation proceedings completed prior to final map approval.
- 3.37 Provide dedication of Right-of-way, including off-site to transition traffic and drainage flows from proposed to existing, to the City.

Hydrology/Drainage

- 3.38 All lots shall drain to streets. All additional drainage due to development shall be mitigated on-site, no cross lot drainage will be allowed unless suitable easements are provided. A Water Quality Management Plan is required to address on-site drainage construction and operation.
- 3.39 Proposed development falls within those areas indicated as subject to flooding under the National Flood Insurance Program. This development will be subject to the provisions of that program, and the City's Flood Plain Ordinances.
- 3.40 Provide adequate City of Loma Linda Drainage Easements (minimum fifteen [15] feet wide) over the natural drainage courses and/or drainage facilities. Design easements to contain the 100-year frequency storm flow plus bulking and freeboard per approved City criteria.
- 3.41 Provide engineered plans for all drainage improvements, to the Public Works Department for approval.
- 3.42 All necessary precautions and preventive measures shall be in place in order to prevent material from being washed away by surface waters of blown by wind. These controls shall include at a minimum: Regular wetting of surface or other similar wind control method, installation of straw or fiber mats to prevent rain related erosion. Detention basin(s) or other appropriately sized barrier to surface flow must be installed at the discharge point(s) of drainage from the site. Any water collected from these controls shall be appropriately disposed of at a disposal site. These measures shall be added as general notes on the site plan and a statement added that the operator is responsible for ensuring that these measures continue to be effective during the duration of the project construction.
- 3.43 Appropriate controls shall be installed to prevent all materials from being tracked off-site by vehicles or other means. These controls may include gravel exits or wash-down areas. Any materials tracked off-site must be removed as soon as possible, not no later than the end of the operation day. This material shall be disposed of at an appropriate disposal site. These measures shall be added as general notes on the site plan and a statement added that the operator is responsible for ensuring that these measures continue to be effective during the duration of the project construction.

Utilities

- 3.44 Sewage connection to be to the City of Loma Linda system.

- 3.45 City of Loma Linda to be water purveyor.
- 3.46 Provide all utility services to each lot, including sanitary sewers, water, electric power, cable, gas, and telephone. All utilities are to be underground.
- 3.47 All fire hydrants and their distribution mains shall be made part of the Public System.
- 3.48 The developer/owner shall pay for the relocation of any power poles or other existing public utilities as necessary.
- 3.49 Water mains, fire hydrants, services and meters shall be sized and installed to City of Loma Linda standards and as shown on the approved utility plans for the development. These utilities shall be public and constructed within public right-of-way or public utility easements. Submit plans for review and approval.
- 3.50 Improvement plans are to include all connections and locations to the City mains for on-site irrigation, including all meter and backflow prevention devices.

Construction

- 3.51 Obtain a permit prior to any construction within the City's right-of-way.
- 3.52 Any abandoned wells on the property or similar structures shall be destroyed in a manner approved by the Public Works Department in accordance with the State of California Department of Health Services.
- 3.53 No commencement of public street work, except rough grading, until dedication for that street has been recorded.
- 3.54 All underground structures, except those desired to be retained, must be broken in, backfilled, and inspected before covering.
- 3.55 Comply with the requirements of the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program, prior to the issuance of grading permit.
- 3.56 During construction of the proposed improvements, equipment shall be properly maintained offsite, any leaks or spills shall be promptly contained and properly disposed.
- 3.57 Comply with the prevailing City standards and requirements at the time of construction.

- 3.58 Provide, to the maximum extent practicable, for the recycling and reuse of existing materials. Coordinate with the Public Works Department to obtain a list of recyclable/reusable materials and recycling vendors. Provide a report of materials recycled/reused; report to include type of materials and quantities of materials recycled/reused.
- 3.59 Prior to construction of the proposed improvements, the project proponent will provide a traffic control plan that will describe in detail safe detours around the project construction site and provide temporary traffic control (i.e. flag person) during demolition debris transport and other construction related truck hauling activities.
- 3.60 During construction of the proposed improvements, construction equipment will be properly maintained at an offsite location and includes proper tuning and timing of engines. Equipment maintenance records and equipment design specification data sheets shall be kept on-site during construction.
- 3.61 During construction of the proposed improvements, all contractors will be advised not to idle construction equipment on site for more than ten minutes.
- 3.62 During construction of the proposed improvements, only low volatility paints and coatings as defined in SCAQMD Rule 1113 shall be used. All paints shall be applied using either high-volume, low-pressure (HVLP) spray equipment or by hand application.
- 3.63 The site shall be treated with water a minimum of twice per day, or other soil-stabilizing agent (approved by SCAQMD and RWQCB) daily to reduce PM₁₀ emissions, in accordance with SCAQMD Rule 403.
- 3.64 Mission Road, Van Leuven Street, Pepper Way, and other proposed on-site streets shall be swept according to a schedule established by the City to reduce PM₁₀ emissions associated with vehicle tracking of soil off-site. The site access haul road will be watered a minimum of twice daily. Timing may vary depending upon time of year of construction.
- 3.65 Grading operations shall be suspended when wind speeds exceed 25 mph to minimize PM₁₀ emissions from the site during such episodes.
- 3.66 Chemical soil stabilizers (approved by SCAQMD and RWQCB) shall be applied to all inactive construction areas that remain inactive for 96 hours or more to reduce PM₁₀ emissions.
- 3.67 Vehicle speeds shall be restricted to less than 15 miles per hour on unpaved portions of the site.

- 3.68 Use of diesel powered equipment is not encouraged. The construction contractor shall select the construction equipment used on-site based on low emission factors and high-energy efficiency. The construction contractor shall ensure that the construction grading plans include a statement that all construction equipment will be tuned and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's specifications.
- 3.69 The construction contractor shall utilize electric or clean alternative fuel powered equipment where feasible.

4. FEES/PERMITS/BONDING

- 4.1 Pay appropriate fees for plan check, inspection, GIS map plan update, and microfilming and storage of maps and plans, and other required fees.
- 4.2 Development Impact fees shall be paid to the City of Loma Linda prior to the issuance of building permits.
- 4.3 A development agreement will be implemented that will provide for funding of landscape and recreational parks within the project area.
- 4.4 Fire Station and Fire Equipment Development Impact Fees shall be assessed to the project at the rates established for Single-Family Residential development in the City's Resolution "Establishing A Schedule Of Development Impact Fees To Finance Capital Facilities Necessitated By New Development" legally in effect at the time of issuance of building permit. Pursuant to LLMC Chapter 3.28, plan check and inspection fees shall be collected at the rates established by City Manager's Executive Order.
- 4.5 Submit proof of payment from the City of San Bernardino for sewer capacity fees and Redlands Unified School District to the Community Development Department prior to the issuance of any building permits.
- 4.6 Bond all required road, drainage, grading, water, sewer, and landscaping improvements in accordance with City Development Code unless constructed and approved prior to recordation of Final Map. No commencement of public street work until the dedication for that street has been recorded. No releasing of a deposit posted for erosion control and monumentation prior to completion of all on-site construction.
- 4.7 All studies required within these conditions require a deposit to cover the cost of the review of the studies. Additional deposits may be required or a refund issued when the costs do not match the deposits.

- 4.8 All legal costs associated with providing the Development Agreement shall be provided by the applicant prior to issuance of any permits.

5. CC&RS

- 5.1 The applicant shall be required to set up a Homeowners' Association (HOA). The HOA shall maintain all common areas, which include all parks, landscape areas and open space identified on the final map as a lettered lot.
- 5.2 Prior to approval of the final map, all organizational documents for the project including any deed restrictions, covenants, conditions, and restrictions shall be submitted to and approved by the Community Development Department and City Attorney's office. Costs for such review shall be borne by the subdivider. A copy of the final documents shall be submitted to the Community Development Department after their recordation. CC&Rs shall include but not be limited to the following provisions:
- A. Since the City is interested in protecting the public health and safety and ensuring the quality and maintenance of common areas under control of a Homeowner's Association, the City shall be included as a party to the CC&Rs for enforcement purposes of those CC&R provisions in which the City has interest, as reflected by the following B through M. However, the City shall not be obligated to enforce the CC&Rs.
 - B. The requirement that Homeowner's Association bylaws be established.
 - C. Provisions for effective establishment, operation, management, use, repair and maintenance of all common areas and facilities including pool areas, recreational facilities, parks, landscaped areas and lots, trails, pathways, walls and fences and paseos.
 - D. Membership in any Homeowner's Association shall be inseparable from ownership in individual dwelling units.
 - E. Architectural controls shall be provided and may include but not be limited to provisions regulating exterior finishes, roof materials, fences and walls, accessory structures such as patios, sunshades, trellises, gazebos, awnings, room additions, exterior mechanical equipment, television and radio antenna.
 - F. Maintenance standards shall be provided for applicable items listed in Section C above in CC&Rs. Examples of maintenance standards are shown below:

- (1) All common area landscaping and private lawn areas visible from any public way shall be properly maintained such that they are evenly cut, evenly edged, free of bare or brown spots, free of debris and free of weeds above the level of the lawn. All planted areas other than lawns shall be free of weeds, dead vegetation and debris. All trees and shrubs shall be trimmed so they do not impede pedestrian traffic along the walkways. All trees shall also be root pruned to eliminate exposed surface roots and damage to sidewalks, driveways and structures.
 - (2) Common areas shall be maintained in such a manner as to avoid the reasonable determination of a duly authorized official of the City that a public nuisance has been created by the absence of adequate maintenance such as to be detrimental to public health, safety or general welfare, or that such a condition of deterioration or disrepair cause harm or is materially detrimental to property values or improvements within the boundaries of the subdivision and Homeowner's Association, to surrounding property, or to property or improvements within the project.
- G. Residents shall not store or park any non-motorized vehicles, trailers regardless of length, or motorized vehicles that exceed 7 feet high, 7 feet wide or 20 feet long in any parking or driveway area except for purpose of loading, unloading, making deliveries or emergency repairs except that the Homeowner's Association may adopt rules and regulations to authorize exceptions.
- H. The Homeowner's Association is responsible for monitoring and enforcing any and all parking regulations as they apply to private property. Individual property owners shall park vehicles in garage spaces. Storage of personal items may occur in the garages only to the extent that vehicles may still be able to be parked within the required garage spaces.
- I. All utility services serving the site shall be installed and maintained underground as depicted on the site plan.
- J. The Homeowner's Association shall be required to file the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of at least one member of the Association Board and where applicable, a Manager of the project before January 1st of each year with the City of Loma Linda Community Development Department for the purpose of contacting the association in the case of emergency or in those cases where the City has an interest in CC&R violations.

- K. Perimeter project block walls to be constructed on private property shall be maintained and replaced, if necessary by a Homeowner's Association. This shall not preclude a Homeowner's Association from assessing charges to individual property owner for structural damage to the wall or fence.
- L. No amendment to alter, modify, terminate or change the Homeowner's Association's obligation to maintain the common areas and the project perimeter wall or other CC&R provisions in which the city has an interest, as noted above, or to alter, modify, terminate or change the City's right to enforce maintenance of the common areas and maintenance of the project perimeter wall, shall be effective without the prior written approval of the City of Loma Linda Community Development Department.
- M. Maintenance of all manufactured slopes on individual numbered lots shall be the responsibility of the individual property owners.

Attachment E

**Planning Commission Staff Report
and Draft Minutes
May 5, 2004 Meeting**

Staff Report

City of Loma Linda

From the Department of Community Development

PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING OF MAY 5, 2003

TO: PLANNING COMMISSION

FROM: DEBORAH WOLDRUFF, AICP, DIRECTOR,
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

SUBJECT: ZONE CHANGE (ZC) NO. 03-06, TENTATIVE TRACT MAP (TT) NO. 03-05 (TTM NO. 16323) – A REQUEST TO SUBDIVIDE 15 ACRES INTO 95 NEW SINGLE FAMILY LOTS, TWO EXISTING SINGLE FAMILY LOTS, AND NINE LETTERED LOTS LOCATED ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF MISSION ROAD INCLUDING AND TO THE WEST OF THE EDISON EASEMENT AND PEPPER WAY.

SUMMARY

The project is a request to subdivide a 15-acre property, which includes the Edison Easement, into 97 numbered lots and nine lettered lots for the purpose of developing 95 single family detached residences. The subdivision also includes two additional lots for two existing homes. The nine lettered lots would be for two parks and open space. The proposal also includes a Zone Change (ZC No. 03-006) to change the zoning from Single Family Residence (R-1) to Planned Community (PC). The project includes a Planned Community Document for the small lot subdivision proposal, to replace the traditional zoning and development standards. A Development Agreement between the City and the applicant is included as part of the project to assist in the production of future affordable housing throughout the City. Site layout and design for future housing is not proposed at this time.

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission recommend the following actions to the City Council:

1. Adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration (Attachment A);
2. Approve and adopt Zone Change No. 03-06, based on the Findings;
3. Approve the Development Agreement (Attachment B); and,
4. Approve Tentative Tract Map No. 16323 (Attachment C) based on the Findings, and subject to the attached Conditions of Approval (Attachment D).

PERTINENT DATA

Applicant: Mission Development Company, LLC

| | |
|---------------|--|
| General Plan: | Medium Density Residence (5 to 10 d.u./acre) |
| Zoning: | Single Family Residence (R-1) |
| Site: | The project site, which includes the Edison Easement, is bounded by Mission Road on the north, residential development on the east, and San Timoteo Creek and multi-residential dwelling on the south. Multiple-family residential dwelling units are west of the site. Two existing residences are within the tract located at 25839 and 25867 Mission Road. (APN 0292-112-03, 04, 14, 15). |
| Topography: | Relatively flat |
| Vegetation: | Patchy scrub and native grasses on the vacant portions of the site |

BACKGROUND AND EXISTING SETTING

Background

The project is located within the Mission Historic District Overlay Zone. The City has adopted an ordinance requires that any development within the District conform to a strict set of city-adopted development/design standards, which are intended to preserve and enhance the historic character of the area. Historically, the project area has been used for agricultural purposes consisting mostly of citrus groves and a dairy. The entire citrus orchard has been removed. As part of the project, the dairy structures, including a hay barn and water trough, will be demolished. These structures have been evaluated in the Cultural Resources Report, and have been determined to be historically insignificant.

The project area includes two existing residences fronting on Mission Road that are to remain. The residences are included within the project are because at the time this application was submitted to the City, there was more than one property owner of the project area, including the owners of the two residences. The residences will remain under private ownership and are not part of the development.

This project does not include the design of the future housing. However, the houses shall be designed according to the "Livable Community" concepts and the objectives of the Mission Road Historic District Overlay Ordinance when a Precise Plan of Design application is submitted.

Existing Setting

A detailed discussion of the existing setting for the project is contained in Section 1.1 of the Initial Study (Attachment A)

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT (CEQA) STATUS

On April 15, 2004, a Notice of Intent (NOI) to Adopt a Negative Declaration and Initial Study (Attachment A) were prepared and issued for public review. The mandatory CEQA 20-day public review began on April 15, 2004 and ends on May 5, 2004. The Initial Study evaluates potential impact categories and appropriate mitigation measures. Any potential impacts can be mitigated to a level of insignificance and mitigation measures have been included as conditions of approval (Attachment D). Therefore, the project can be approved with a Mitigated Negative Declaration in accordance with the requirements of CEQA.

ANALYSIS

Project Description and Site Design

The applicant has incorporated neo-traditional and livable communities concepts into the proposal that include smaller residential lots and narrow interior streets. The proposed subdivision, which creates 95 new single-family lots, has a gross density of 6.3 dwelling units per acre. The average lot size is approximately 2,846 square feet without the two existing single-family residences. The actual lot sizes range from approximately 2,067 to 3,793 square feet. The two existing single-family residence lots are 18,061 and 11,863 square feet. The unique layout of the project is due to the constraints associated with the depth and narrowness of the project site, the location of the Edison Easement and two existing residences within the project area. These constraints are the contributing factors in the proposed design.

Two public parks are proposed which include a pocket park on the northern portion of the tract and the Edison Easement. The pocket park is approximately .27 acres and will allow for active park uses. The 5-acre of Edison Easement will provide active and passive park uses. The proposal includes important linkages for pedestrians and vehicles, alike. A trail system has been incorporated into the Edison Easement, which will provide linkage between the San Timoteo Channel and Mission Road. Once the Bailey Bridge is installed across the San Timoteo Channel, this trail will link into the City wide trail system along the Edison Easement. Several connections to the Edison Easement trail are provided along the southern linear portion of the proposed tract. The total amount of proposed park space surpasses the General Plan policy of 5-acres per 1,000 residents and provides a ratio equivalent to 14-acres per 1,000 residents.

Additional open space has been provided at the end of the cul-de-sac at the southern portion of the lot and along the frontage of Van Lueven Street and Mission Road. These areas will be landscaped and maintained by the Homeowner's Association.

The tract has access off of Pepper Way and Van Leuven Street. The project is also connected to the development to the east through Street G, which extends across the Edison Easement. The on-site circulation has been designed to discourage through traffic with the exception of Van Leuven Street and Pepper Way. The southerly portion

of the site is accessed from Van Leuven and has a divided road for the first 100 feet. The median will be landscaped, providing a pleasant entry into the tract. As previously mentioned Street G serves as an additional outlet to the southern portion of the site. At the end of the cul-de-sac are guest parking spaces and a circular median, which will divide the two way traffic. This median will be landscaped.

The northern portion of the tract is accessed from Pepper Way. Streets B and C intersect Pepper Way and Street C provides access to the interior portion of the north side of the tract. Streets B and part of C are 30 feet wide and provide parking on both sides. Street C narrows into a one-way street, which connects with Streets D, E, and F, and loops around the pocket park and residences. These one-way streets are typically 24 feet wide. Parking on the one-way streets would be limited to one side only to allow for the maneuverability of emergency vehicles and trash trucks. Guest parking is limited to on-street parking. Sidewalks are included only in a few areas. The absence of sidewalks would encourage residents to utilize the narrow one-way streets as extended "driveways", which would allow for the mixture of pedestrians and vehicular traffic. An emergency access into the northern portion of the tract is provided from Van Leuven Street. The narrower streets, medians, and street layout are consistent with the "Livable Communities" concepts and should provide some traffic calming for the development.

A Condition of Approval includes the requirement that the proposed community be pre-wired to host coaxial, cable, and fiber optic installation for each unit as per the Loma Linda Connected Communities (LLCC) policy. This is a new City requirement that will ensure new residences are equipped with links to meet the latest communications/technological advances. Homes that are pre-wired in this manner are commonly referred to as "smart homes". The added technology has many advantages including increased marketability of the units.

The remaining structures of the Van Uffelen Dairy are proposed to be removed. The project is not directly adjacent to or the location of an identified historically significant structure. Condition No. 1.17 requires that a licensed archeologist be on site during all grading and excavation. Mitigation measures have been included in the conditions of approval to address the discovery of artifacts or burial sites during excavation or grading. According to the Archeological Analysis for this project, the probability of discovering burial grounds on the south side of Mission Road is highly unlikely. However, artifacts could be discovered in the area due to Mission Road (Sonora Road or Old San Bernardino Road) being used for major transportation route in the past.

The proposed tract and future residential community will require the establishment of a Homeowners Association (HOA) as well as the development and recordation of appropriate Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC & R's).

Zoning Map Amendment

The project includes a request to amend the official Zoning Map from Single-Family Residence (R-1) to Planned Community (PC). The proposed PC zone designation would limit this area to residential uses and ancillary amenities that would support a residential tract, such as a tot lot, community pool, recreational facilities, parks, and trails. A Planned Community Document (Attachment E) has been developed to provide the development standards and permitted uses within the proposed tentative tract.

Development Agreement

The proposed project is located in the Redevelopment Project Area. As a result, affordable housing is required of the builder. The option is to provide fifteen percent of the units as affordable or to pay an in-lieu fee to assist in the production of future, affordable housing units throughout the City. The applicant has chosen the option to pay the in-lieu fee (see Attachment C).

COMMENTS

The Public Safety Department has reviewed the proposed map and provided additional conditions of approval to compensate for the 28 and 30-foot wide streets and 24-foot wide one-way streets. The conditions include additional fire sprinkler requirements for the residences. The proposed street width is adequate to allow for passage of emergency vehicles and apparatus provided that there is no parking on one side of the one-way streets and no parking on Street G due to turning radius requirements from Street A. Conditions for these issues have been included.

Public Works Department has reviewed the Traffic Impact Analysis prepared by Meyer, Mohaddes Associates, Inc. and concurs with the recommended mitigation measures, which includes contributing to the fair share costs associated with the installation of a traffic signal at the intersection of Mountain View Avenue and Mission Road to improve the traffic congestion under peak hours. This intersection was identified in the Traffic Impact Analysis as having a cumulative impact during peak hours due to the existing traffic and the addition of the project traffic and future traffic from development proposed in the general vicinity. This would improve the intersection traffic from a level of service D and F to a level of service B and C during peak hours.

The Public Works Department feels that the proposed street widths are too narrow and is not in support of the proposed design. They have recommended that Streets within the northern portion of the proposed Tentative Tract be private streets or that all public streets within the tract meet the City's standard for residential streets of 60-foot right-of-way, which is a measurement of 36 feet curb to curb. Standard streets also require sidewalk placement within the right-of-way. The proposed street widths are indicative of the "Livable Communities" concepts, which have been endorsed by the Planning Commission. The PC Zoning allows for the creation of unique and creative design standards, which provides flexibility to include attributes common in "Livable

Communities." Narrower streets are common in "Livable Communities" and the flexibility of the PC zone is exhibited in the proposed street design. The widths of the two-way streets are similar to and wider than the streets provided in the adjacent tract to the east (Tract 16341- Mission Trails). The alleys in this adjacent tract are also 4 feet narrower than the one-way streets in the northern portion of the proposed tentative tract.

In response to the routing for this project, the City received the following comment from outside agency:

- San Bernardino County Department of Public Works (March 23, 2004) The letter stated that the site is in the A-99 flood designation for the San Timoteo Channel but raised concerns about the proximity of the project to the Mission Channel. Their concern is that once the improvements to the San Timoteo Channel are completed and the A-99 designation is removed, the site may still be in a flood zone relative to the Mission Channel. A copy of the letter was forwarded to the Public Works Department for their review. The issues related to the Mission Channel will be addressed in a drainage and hydrology study to be submitted as part of the plan check process.

Copies of all public comments are maintained in the file for Tentative Tract Map No. 16323.

FINDINGS

Zone Change Findings

Changes to the zoning ordinance and map are considered legislative acts and do not require findings. State law does require that the zoning be consistent with the General Plan. The proposed "Planned Community" (PC) zoning district for residential development is consistent with existing General Plan Land Use designation of "Medium Density-Residential" and proposed designations of the Draft General Plan. As stated above the site is suitable for residential development under the "Planned Community" (PC) zone and would not cause substantial environmental damage or be detrimental to the public welfare.

Tentative Tract Map Findings

1. *That the proposed map is consistent with the applicable general plan and zoning designations.*

The proposed map is consistent with the existing and draft General Plan land use designations. The project includes a Zone Change to "Planned Community". The text created for the Planned Community incorporates the development standards for the project and is consistent with the "Planned Community" zoning district.

2. *The design or improvement of the proposed subdivision is consistent with the applicable general plan and zoning designations.*

The project complies with the existing General Plan Land Use designation of "Medium Density Residential." The project is also consistent with the draft General Plan Land Use designation of "Medium Density Residential" and "Medium High Density Residential," with "5.1 to 9 dwelling units per acre" and "9.1 to 13 dwelling units per acre," respectively. The draft General Plan identifies the northern portion of the project above Van Leuven Street as "Medium Density" and the southern half, below Van Leuven Street as "Medium High Density". The Planned Community Document was designed in accordance with the Municipal Code, Chapter 17.70 Planned Community District zone. Portions of the site have abandoned dairy structures. However, the majority of the site is vacant. The development of this site with the appropriate residential uses will enhance the quality of the surrounding neighborhood and the City.

3. *The site is physically suitable for the type of development proposed.*

The project shall not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement in the immediate vicinity. The project includes the demolition of an existing dairy operational structures. The use of the dairy is not economically viable and development of single-family residences will be compatible with the existing residential area to the west and east and enhance the area. The main buildings of the dairy have been demolished with the residential development under construction to the east. The project shall not result in impacts to the established community.

4. *The site is physically suitable for the proposed density of development.*

The project is compatible with the surrounding residential uses to the west. The project density of 6.3 dwelling units per acre complies with both the existing and draft General Plan. The irregular depth of the proposed project site is overcome by the proposed design and the utilization of the Edison Easement for parkland and open space.

5. *The design of the subdivision is not likely to cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and unavoidably injure fish and wildlife or their habitat.*

There is no natural vegetation or wildlife present on site. There is virtually no undisturbed area remaining on the site. Therefore, development of the site shall not cause any substantial environmental damage or substantially and unavoidably injure fish and wildlife or their habitat. There is no riparian or wetland habitat on site. The San Timoteo Creek Channel is located south of the project area. This area south of the project site will not be disturbed.

6. *The design of the subdivision is not likely to cause serious public health problems.*

The design of the subdivision and the end use of the residential tract shall not cause any serious public health problems. The design is sensitive to the historical and cultural significance of the area and implements "Livable Community" concepts into the design. The Mitigated Negative Declaration does not identify any impacts that could cause serious public health problems.

7. *The design of the subdivision will not conflict with easements, acquired by the public at large, for access through or use of property within the proposed subdivision.*

Access to the site is provided from Pepper Way and Van Leuven Street. The two entrances into the site allow full access without impeding the through traffic. Access for an emergency vehicle is adequate with a minimum 30-foot wide two way streets and 24-foot wide one-way streets. The design of the proposed subdivision does not conflict with any easements. The inclusion and utilization of the Edison Easement in the proposed design enhances the neighborhood by providing open space, park amenities and recreational areas for future residents and the general public, but still allows Edison to use the easement for its original purpose of transmitting electrical power.

CONCLUSION

The proposed Tentative Tract Map 16323 conforms to the City's Subdivision regulations and the "Planned Community" (PC) zoning standards. The project complies with the Medium Density Residential designation in the existing General Plan and Medium Density Residential and Medium High Residential land uses designations in the draft General Plan. The zone change to "Planned Community" (PC) allows the flexibility to develop a variety of single-family residential communities that can be master planned for the proposed project site. The site constraints of the irregular depth and the location of the Edison Easement have been overcome by the unique design and enhancement of the area. The proposed subdivision is sensitive to the historical significance of the area and compatible with the residential neighborhoods to the west and east. The granting of this Zone Change, Development Agreement, and Tentative Tract Map would not be detrimental to the public welfare or injurious to the properties in the vicinity.

The Mitigation Measures listed in the Initial Study (Attachment A) will minimize the potential environmental impacts and are the responsibility of the subdivider. They have been made part of the Conditions of Approval (Attachment D).

Respectfully Submitted,


Lori Lamson
Senior Planner

ATTACHMENTS

- A. Negative Declaration (NOI/Initial Study)
- B. Development Agreement
- C. Tentative Tract Map
- D. Conditions of Approval
- E. Planned Community Document

I:\Project Files\TTM16323\PC5-05-04sr.doc

CITY OF LOMA LINDA
PLANNING COMMISSION

APPROVED DENIED
CONTINUED

TO: _____
AT THE MEETING OF:
May 3, 2004
BY: Stacyne Lavalrie
PLANNING COMMISSION SECRETARY

Minutes

City of Loma Linda

Department of Community Development

Planning Commission

Chair Neff called a regular meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 7:19 p.m., **Wednesday, May 5, 2004**, in the City Council Chambers, 25541 Barton Road, Loma Linda, California.

Commissioners Present: Randy Neff, Chair
Mary Lee Rosenbaum, Vice Chair
Michael Christianson
Shakil Patel

Commissioners Absent: Eric Essex

Staff Present: Deborah Woldruff, Director, Community Development
Rolland Crawford, Director/Fire Chief, Public Safety
Lori Lamson, Senior Planner
Jeff Peterson, Associate Engineer, Public Works Department
Jocelyne Larabie, Administrative Secretary

ITEMS TO BE DELETED OR ADDED

There were no items to be added or deleted. However, Director Woldruff requested that the items be taken out of order and that Item 2, Zone Change (ZC) No. 03-006 (Mission Development) Tentative Tract Map No. 16323 (TT) No. 03-005 be heard first followed by the discussion on the Draft General Plan. It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to address Item 2 under New Items, Public Hearing at the beginning of the meeting.

ORAL REPORTS/PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Director Woldruff requested that the Planning Commission allow Mr. Peter Cowley to present his comments and concern regarding the earlier presentation by the Loma Linda University Adventist Health Sciences Center (LLUAHSC). She apologized to Mr. Cowley because he was did not receive an agenda for that item, which was the one he was most interested in; therefore he arrived late because of the oversight.

Chair Neff stated that the Commission had no objections and would accept Mr. Cowley's public testimony.

Mr. Peter Cowley, 24979 Starr Street, Loma Linda thanked the Commission for allowing him to speak on the subject of the LLU presentation. He stated that he had some concerns of the Loma Linda University Adventist Health Sciences Center (LLUAHSC). He continued to say that the public review period for the Environmental Impacts Report (EIR) would close on May 6, 2004 and that it did not seem appropriate to close a period of public review before residents

could respond to the document, and requested that the review period be left open until more information was received regarding the LLUAHSC project.

Director Woldruff explained that the General Plan EIR comment period would end on May 6, 2004 but that under Permit Streamlining Act staff must process any and all project applications submitted. She added that the City would consider Mr. Cowley's comments.

Mr. Cowley asked if it was the City's intention to grant imminent domain to the Loma Linda University Medical Center and seize residents' private homes. Director Woldruff explained that the colored areas pictured on the map represented a general area for the proposed project and it was not intended to appear that LLUAHSC or the City would exercise imminent domain on people's properties.

Mr. Cowley concluded his comments with a statement that he was not in favor of the mixed-use designation because he feared that Loma Linda University Medical Center would build a three-story building or a parking lot adjacent to his home.

Director Woldruff informed the Planning Commission that she had assured Mr. Cowley that he would receive a copy of the agenda when the Loma Linda University Medical Center submitted a formal application for the project.

NEW ITEM

PUBLIC HEARING

PC-04-26 - ZONE CHANGE (ZC) NO. 03-006 (MISSION DEVELOPMENT) TENTATIVE TRACT MAP NO. 16323 (TT) NO. 03-005 - Tentative Tract Map No. 16323 is a residential subdivision creating 95 single-family residential lots. The subdivision also includes two additional lots for existing homes and additional lettered lots for parks and open space. The proposal also includes a Zone Change (ZC No. 03-006) to change the zoning from Single Family Residential (R-1) to Planned Community (PC). The project will include a Planned Community Document for the small lot subdivision proposal, to replace the traditional zoning and development standards. A development agreement will be required for the affordable housing requirement. Site layout and design is not proposed at this time. The project is located south of Mission Road, west of and including the Edison Easement and west of California Street in the City of Loma Linda and County of San Bernardino (APN 0292-112-03, 04, 14, 15).

Senior Planner Lamson gave the staff report. She described the proposal as a small lot subdivision, which implemented concepts of the livable walkable community model and neo-traditional neighborhoods supported by the Planning Commission. She added that the 15 acres are proposed to be subdivided into 97 lots for the purpose of constructing 95 single-family homes and included the Edison Easement, which is approximately 5 acres. Senior Planner Lamson explained that an additional quarter acre was made up of the pocket park on the northern part of the tract and the pockets of open space and trails throughout the project area, which connect to the larger regional trail system as well as provide access within the tract and to surrounding development.

Senior Planner Lamson continued her report and explained that the proposed density of the project was 6.3 dwelling units per acre, which is within the existing General Plan that allows for 5.1 to 10 d.u. per acre, and the Draft General Plan, which allows for 5.1 to 9 d.u. per acre for its

5.1 to 10 d.u. per acre, and the Draft General Plan, which allows for 5.1 to 9 d.u. per acre for its medium density designations. She stated that the lot sizes ranged from approximately 2,067 to 3,793 square feet and added that there were two existing single-family residences fronting Mission Road within the map area that would not be removed or altered.

Senior Planner Lamson continued her report to say that the project required a zone change from single family to Planned Community, which is consistent with the Draft General Plan. She pointed out that the existing zoning was not consistent with the existing General Plan designation but that the General Plan always prevailed. Ms. Lamson stated that the proposal only included the tract map and the site design. She added that the layout for future housing was not being proposed with this submittal; however, the applicant had provided conceptual layout and house designs.

Senior Planner Lamson explained that a Planned Community document was part of the zone change request to provide the development standards for the project and included a Development Agreement for the payment of in lieu fees to the City for future affordable housing needs in the City.

Ms. Lamson informed the Planning Commission that the project was submitted to the Historical Commission for their review and the approval of a Certificate of Appropriateness due to the project's location in the Mission Historic Overlay District. She added that the Historical Commission approved the Certificate of Appropriateness with the following conditions: 1) that lots 32 and 33, 34 and 35 be combined into two larger lots facing Mission Road with side loaded access, or that the four lots be converted into open space along Mission Road; 2) the troughs in the old shed/barns on the old dairy site be moved into the Edison Easement for use as planters or something similar if they are safe for public use. Ms. Lamson reported that the Historical Commission also recommended that the Planning Commission and the City Council reduce the density of the project and future projects in the area. She explained that this would mean a change in both the existing and Draft General Plan land use designations since this project complies with the approved range of density.

Senior Planner Lamson reported that the applicant has redesigned the northern portion of the tract to increase the size of the two lots adjacent to Mission Road and to provide frontage on Mission Road with side loaded access, as requested by the Historical Commission. She continued to say that an open space area divided the two lots creating a wide lot appearance from Mission Road and that they would be maintained by the Homeowners' Association. In addition to widening the two lots, the applicant also revised the right-of-way width to the northern portion by providing sidewalks and a 5-foot parkway on each street to provide access around the tract for utilities as well as pedestrians.

Ms. Lamson reported that the Public Works Department had concerns about the size of the roads, but the project was designed with the livable walkable communities concepts as directed by the Planning Commission and part of the concepts did provide for narrower streets, which are provided by the Planned Community zone. She added that Public Safety had indicated that they could provide access through and into the proposed development.

Senior Planner Lamson concluded her report and informed the Planning Commission that once the discussion turned to the review of the conditions, staff recommended that the conditions set by the Historical Commission be added, and an additional condition related to the reimbursement of fees for the Development Agreement.

Chair Neff opened the public comment period at 7:35 pm.

Mr. Glenn Elssmann, 24949 Prospect Avenue addressed the Commission and thanked them for the opportunity to present the Mission Lane project. He also thanked staff for their patience during the many revisions. He then introduced the engineer for the project, Mr. John Goodman, of Goodman & Associates, and Mr. John Snell of American Pacific Homes.

Mr. Elssmann provided a PowerPoint presentation illustrating the plans for the Mission Lane project. He stated that the project had a very linear orientation. He continued to say that the project encompassed 15 acres and that the biggest challenge from the design point of view was the narrow distance between the property and the right-of-way of the Southern California Edison easement. He added that it was a very short distance and doesn't allow for a tremendous creativity and dynamics but at the same time offering a great amount of open space.

Mr. Elssmann pointed out prominent gateway features and as part of the approval of Mission Trails, Ryland Homes, already under construction, was the creation of an island to provide a safe area to cross Van Leuven Street. He added that they were able to save the Beaumont Avenue Bridge and have relocated it on the their property. He continued to say that the project had connections to Mission Trails at various points that would allow this new community to gain access to a regional trails system, which was made up of five or six miles of trails. He added that they had worked with their neighbor to the west to make sure that local residents would be able to connect and use the trial system.

Mr. Elssmann used the opportunity to show some of the specific elements of the project. He continued to explain that on the north side of Van Leuven, the plan was modified at the Historical Commission's recommendation to safeguard historical resources by eliminating a lot and reoriented the house so the access would be from the interior street not from Mission Road. Mr. Elssmann explained that an entrance into the community was designed from Pepper Way creating a one-way loop.

Mr. Elssmann continued his presentation pointing out that on the south side the plans provided the additional parking spaces, ample room for emergency apparatus, a secondary connection to Mission Trails. He stated that it was their intention to replace the citrus being eliminated from the project site, possibly provide a community garden, open space, homes will have wrought iron fences to match the green wrought iron fencing in Mission Trails, and a trail crossing on Van Leuven. He reiterated that the park space was a public park accessible to all members of the communities.

Mr. Elssmann turned the focus of the project to the conceptual architecture. He commented that the south side would have a parkway in the front just as the north side did. Mr. Elssmann stated that when the project was brought forward in a PPD, the different architectural styles would be presented in full detail. He pointed out that each house would have a gate instead of side yard fences with an easement area that would allow the homeowners the use of a larger area that exceeded the usable side yard space in Mission Trails, and a shielded space for the trash containers.

Mr. Elssmann commented on the Conditions of Approval stating that he had few questions but would wait until the Planning Commission's discussion on the issue.

Mr. Elssmann concluded his presentation stating that, as pointed out in staff's report, the project was in conformance with the existing General Plan and the draft General Plan, and added that this community, managed by a Homeowners' Association, would be responsible for overseeing the maintenance of the largest public space that the City of Loma Linda had to date. He further added that the public open spaces would be privately maintained and all rules enforced by the Homeowners' Association. He commented that he anticipated that the sale prices would be in the range of \$250,000.

Chair Neff opened the public comment at 8:05 pm and opened the discussion to the Planning Commission beginning with the issue of the density of the proposed project.

Peter Cowley, 24979 Starr Street, Loma Linda, commented that, in this type of project with such a high density parking, on a 32-foot wide street, would be inadequate for guests. He continued to say that the other concerns as far as the idea of a dog park and the space between the houses as illustrated on the slides shown earlier. Senior Planner Lamson responded to Mr. Cowley's concerns stating that the concepts of the dog park and the community gardens, along with the designs of the homes were not part of the approval of this project at this time. Director Woldruff added that through the PPD process, the Parks, Recreation, and Beautification and Trails Development committees would review the plans for those items.

Chair Neff requested that Mr. Elssmann respond to Mr. Cowley's concerns. Mr. Elssmann introduced Mr. John Snell, Vice President of the American Pacific Homes who would also bring to the Planning Commission a development in that area.

John Snell, Vice President of the American Pacific Homes, stated that his company builds a variety of projects of different types throughout the Inland Empire. He addressed the parking issue stating that the CCR's would require that the garages be used exclusively for parking cars, and that the owners would not be allowed to park in the driveway or the street and the Homeowners' Association would establish a parking program with stickers, guest passes, and a tow committee. He commented that the sales representatives would be fully aware of those issues and would pass them on to the prospective buyers. He stated that the HOA would be established after the first home was sold, with regularly scheduled HOA meetings and enforcement starting immediately after the house is occupied.

Ms. Georgia Hodgkin, 24360 Lawton Avenue, stated that she was a member of the Historical Commission and explained that the mission of the Commission was to set goals to maintain the historical flavor of the city. She continued to say that the density of Mr. Elssmann's project was way too large to fit within what Loma Linda has been. She requested that the Planning Commission look at the number of homes and stated that the potential for decay within a neighborhood that only had six feet between each home was powerful. She added that if the project were approved, it would set a precedent that would allow other developments of this type to be built.

Mr. James Shipp, 11553 Cedar Way, Chair of the Historical Commission, stated that the City had only one California State official landmark and that it was the Guanchama Rancheria and that he expected that a large number of residents would like to celebrate the 200th anniversary of the naming of the City of Loma Linda. He continued to say that it was the oldest pre-historic and historic site, he asked that the Planning Commission to maintain an awareness of that and ask if the project celebrated and show adequate respect to the oldest site. He also commented that the developer readily responded to the Commission's comments concerning the orientation of the homes facing the Guanchama marker. Mr. Shipp pointed out that other members of the Historical

Commission were concerned with the density and reminded the Commission that the project site was in close proximity to the most historic spot of the City.

Mr. Barry Wood, 10872 Pepper Way, addressed the Commission to say that the developer was exaggerating when he reported that the project was being built on 15 acres when truly it was proposed on a 10-acre site. He added that the calculated density was much higher than reported. Director Woldruff replied to Mr. Wood that even on the 10-acre property the project was within the density allowable by the general Plan and the Draft General Plan.

Mr. Richard Wiley, 10848 Pepper Way, commented on that there were four two-story units facing Pepper Way from the direction of the Mountain View Town Homes. He suggested that the developer could consider building single-story homes to allow current homeowners to maintain their view of the mountains.

Senior Planner Lamson explained that the density calculation, with or without the 5 acres in the Edison easement, would still comply with the 5.1 to 9 units per acre requirement in the draft General Plan and the 5.1 to 10 units in the existing General Plan. She further explained that because of the location and the shape of the project site, staff viewed the project as a transitional density project going from a very high density with the apartments and town homes to the west, to a medium density for the proposed project, to a somewhat lower but still a medium density in the tract to the east.

Director Woldruff suggested that the Commission look at this project as a detached condominium project or town home project. She explained that this type of project had become more prevalent than condominium or town home project of the past, due to the fact that condominium and town home projects had become cost prohibitive. High insurance costs make condo and town project much more difficult to build. She stated that the common wall of a condominium and town home is the issue in high insurance costs to the developer.

On a question by Commissioner Rosenbaum regarding affordable housing unit requirements, Ms. Lamson explained that the developer was opting to pay an in-lieu fee to assist the City with future affordable housing projects in all areas of the City through a Development Agreement.

Commissioner Rosenbaum requested clarification on the reason for the review of a Planned Community document. Senior Planner Lamson described the need for the Planned Community document and explained that the current zoning of the project site did not comply with the existing General Plan designation; therefore changing the zoning to a planned community zone would be compatible with underlying zoning required a Planned Community document.

Chair Neff invited the applicant, Mr. Glenn Elssmann to address the public comments presented earlier.

The applicant, Mr. Glenn Elssmann, 24949 Prospect Avenue addressed the Planning Commission and stated that Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&R) were a very effective tool to address the parking questions. He added that there was parking on the south side on both sides of the street, and a one-way street with parking on one side facing those homes.

Mr. Elssmann stated that he appreciated Mr. Shipp's presentation on behalf of the Historical Commission pointing out the historic landmark across the street from the project, and added that he would work with the Historical Commission to create a wide gateway entrance to form a view corridor that would provide a better focus for the historical resources located along Mission Road.

Mr. Elssmann stated he would like to reserve the name of "Silva" for the entrance on the north side of the project. He pointed out that the name was on the City's approved list of street names. He added that Frank Silva was the son of the original owner who operated a chicken ranch. He concluded by saying that he believed that the architecture of the project must be appropriate for the style of the Mission Road area.

Chair Neff requested clarification on a comment made earlier regarding the characteristics of the north end of the project compared to those of the south end.

Mr. Elssmann explained that the slide represented the north side of the project in the area of the park and that the addition that would be made in this area would be a parkway and the trees that would be actually very representative of the north side.

Chair Neff asked if Mr. Elssmann had any concerns about parking in the vicinity of the public park. Mr. Elssmann replied that the park had been designed as a neighborhood park to fit in with the trail system that would connect with tracts to the east and the west and that he envisioned the majority of users would be residents of the adjacent community that could access the parks on foot, and added that the parking would be ample for visitors from other areas.

Commissioner Rosenbaum had a concern regarding the requirement for the owners to park their cars in the garage and not use the garage for storage and how this would be addressed for families that have more than two vehicles. Ms. Lamson replied if the CCR's were approved in line with what Mr. Snell was indicating, that would be the case. She added that staff would have to consult with the City Attorney on the issue of restricting anyone from parking on a city street. Ms. Lamson concurred with Commissioner Rosenbaum that the issue would come up again during the PPD discussion and added that the only issues about parking at this stage would relate to parking only on one side of the one-way street and no parking on the street that connects on the southern portion of the project to Mission Trails.

Commissioner Christianson wanted to know if there would be a sufficient number of parking spaces for the size of the tract. Chair Neff added to Commissioner Christianson's question to say that it would be very inconvenient for guests to park on Mission Road when they are visiting someone in one of the interior streets.

Mr. Elssmann replied that there was room for at least one car in front of every home with parking on both sides of the street plus spaces in the owner's driveway. Commissioner Christianson received confirmation that there would be parking on both sides of the street on the southern part of the tract that include the six units that have a median in front of their property.

Commissioner Christianson stated that he considered that the idea of having parking on two sides of a 32-foot wide street was very frightening. In response, Senior Planner Lamson gave the example of the project to the east that had 28-foot wide street and parking on both sides.

Commissioner Christianson received confirmation that the street on the north loop was a one-way street. He continued to make certain that he understood that the owners of the house on Lot #28, would have to drive around the whole loop to get to the driveway. Mr. Elssmann addressed Commissioner Christianson's concern and explained that the one-way street was designed to be a traffic-calming feature.

Chair Neff stated that the concerns he had regarding the right-of-way width, location of utilities and so forth had been addressed in the new plans submitted at the meeting. Associate Engineer Peterson concurred with Chair Neff's comments as he also had some serious reservations with the north half of the project because of the extremely narrow right-of-ways that would not provide adequate room for sidewalks, streetlights, and fire hydrants. He added that however, the applicant had addressed those concerns and would leave it up to the Planning Commission to use their discretion as to what they feel was appropriate.

Chair Neff asked Fire Chief Rolland Crawford for his comments concerning the access to the north area for emergency apparatus as well as the long linear lines of the tract itself to the south. Chief Crawford explained that his department recognized that this particular piece of property had some pretty severe limitations especially with the Edison easement and met with Mr. Elssmann and Mr. Goodman, their Engineer on numerous occasions to work through various options. He continued to say that the overall concept of the neo-traditional, with narrower streets had been directed by the Planning Commission and worked to address some of the concerns. The developer proposed a long north/south street that would be 32 feet from curb to curb and it was consistent with what was approved for the Granite Homes tract, which is now known as Laurel Heights. Laurel Heights does have parking on both sides but it also has shorter blocks. The north section has also gone through redesigns to take a very close look at the turning radii and significant adjustments were made to the corners so that we believe we are able to accommodate our fire apparatus. The developer also added an emergency access pathway to accommodate the concerns. He concluded to say that developer and the engineer had been addressed all of them.

Chair Neff asked if there would be sidewalks on both side of the street. Mr. Elssmann replied that there were sidewalks on both sides of tree-lined streets as well as a parkway. He added that there would not be parking adjacent to the park, which illustrates how the one-way street configuration works.

A discussion ensued regarding the Uniform Building Code (UBC) requirements. Mr. Elssmann explained that the side use easement eliminated the side fence between the homes and the livable area did not look out onto a fence. He added that the area would be landscaped and the Homeowners' Association would be responsible for ensuring that structures are not attached to the neighboring house. Mr. Elssmann reassured the Commission that the houses would comply with the UBC.

Chair Neff verified that both properties were in effect sharing the 6-foot side yard. Mr. Elssmann confirmed that that was correct.

Commissioner Christianson had questions regarding the density in Mixed-Use Area E and the types of use allowed under that designation. He cited the following text from the Draft General Plan: "The intent for the portion of the mixed use area located from the southern Mission Road frontage south to San Tim creek is to promote both single-family residential as well as work/live artisan studio environment through a horizontal mixed use pattern. Single-family residential uses are intended along the street frontage and generally in the northern half of the mixed use area D-3 and the southern half bordering San Tim creek a work/live environment is intended. This is intended to feature single-family residences with studio/workshop buildings at the rear of the lot." He added that the text spelled out the appropriate density, as low density being 2.1 to 5 units per acre and medium density of 5.1 to 9 dwelling units per acre and verified that the 5.1 to 9 density is what the project was using. Senior Planner Lamson confirmed that the density of the project was calculated at 6.3 using the entire 15-acre parcel as required by law. She added

that the density must be calculated as a gross density; that means that the entire acreage of the property including the five-acre Edison easement must be used. Ms. Lamson further explained that calculating the density without the five-acre Edison easement would result in a density of 9 units per acre, which is still in the range prescribed by the existing General Plan and the Draft General Plan.

Mr. Elssmann pointed out that, although no product was being presented, the project would offer a floor plan that would include a downstairs' office option equipped with the Loma Linda Connectivity program requirement could present a very attractive feature for someone who had a home office. He added that the feature would be located at the entrance to the house.

Commissioner Christianson stated that he understood that the project was within the parameters, legally. However, public testimony indicated concerns about the proximity to the preeminent historic location in Loma Linda.

Chair Neff suggested to Commissioner Christianson, that his concerns might be answered as the discussion moved through some of the other documents. He turned the discussion to the Negative Declaration and the Notice of Intent and Initial Study, more specifically at Section II – Environmental Checklist.

A discussion ensued regarding the Williamson Act contracts, which is defined as an area entirely designated for agricultural use. Ms. Lamson indicated that no part of the property included land that would come under the Williamson Act.

The discussion continued and turned to the issue of street lighting. Ms. Lamson explained that the lighting would not impact any nighttime views because the builder would have to implement the city standard streetlights that provide a shield to direct the light toward the street and the pedestrian sidewalks.

A discussion commenced regarding Noise issues. Commissioner Rosenbaum stated that as a policy the Commission decided to limit the construction of perimeter walls, and yet, the City requirements to mitigate the noise impact require walls be put up when we for years have not wanted walls to be constructed. Mr. Elssmann explained that with the reorientation of the homes on Mission Road, the need for a sound wall was eliminated. Senior Planner Lamson added the only sound wall that would be necessary would be a very small portion that would face Mission Road from the house to the side property line that could potentially be a gate.

Ms. Lamson continued to say that in order to protect and preserve the rear and side yard areas for a decibel reading of less than 65. However, if the setbacks were more than 35 feet, the builder could install a wood fence, otherwise if is within the 35 feet, the building would have to mitigate by putting in a 6-foot high block wall to enclose the portion of that area that is adjacent to Mission Road, which is the noise source. Mr. Elssmann added that it was his objective was to develop an open quality un-walled community.

Commissioner Rosenbaum stated that she wanted to be on record to say that she did not want a solid wall. Mr. Elssmann replied that he fully embraced that concept and that the orientation of the house to the front would mitigate that.

A discussion on construction ensued and resulted in a change in the construction hours to prohibit work between 6 pm and 7 am.

A discussion commenced about guest parking and the configuration of the north portion of the tract. Mr. Snell answered Commissioner Christianson's questions regarding the implementation of the parking regulations stating that guests and visitors would be authorized to park in the driveway, but that the final conditions would be presented when they came back with the Precise Plan of Design.

A discussion ensued regarding trash truck operation and circulation in the tract and concerns were mentioned regarding the trash truck's articulated arm that services trash receptacles on only one side of the street. Senior Planner Lamson that staff would work with Waste Management during the planning of the PPD as far as locations of the trash receptacles.

Commissioner Patel verified that the project would have a 4-sided architecture for the corner lots. Mr. Elssmann concurred.

None of the commissioners had any comments on the DA.

Commissioner Patel expressed concern regarding the very long straight block on Street A in the southern portion of the tract and asked if some type of architectural feature could be added to enhance the look of the street. Mr. Elssmann stated that the distance at that location was less than most streets in the community today.

Chair Neff verified that the street was 1,078 feet as indicated on the tract map. Commissioner Christianson concurred that Commissioner Patel was indeed right that the block was very long. Mr. Elssmann assured the Commission that a variety of architectural styles would be addressed in the PPD. Commissioner Patel stated that he was skeptical because whatever the builder did the street would still be a straight line. Mr. Elssmann replied that he had been working with the architect and staff on varying the setbacks, the rooflines, and the porches to make sure the situation was addressed. He added that the street actually does angle slightly from Van Leuven all the way back of the tract.

A lengthy discussion ensued regarding a variety of features that would enhance the look of the street.

- Keep the end of the street open to connect with the trail system
- Add Pocket park access or additional trail connection to the Edison easement
- Reconfigure the lots & add more landscaping

Mr. Elssmann explained that effective ways of addressing the street scene issue would include the size and selection of trees to create a canopy effect in a timely manner, and a variety of elevation, colors and materials used to create character and interest. He added that there are 25 homes on each side of the street and that he would work very hard to address the issue.

Chair Neff concluded the discussion and suggested that those avenues be taken with the idea of addressing breaking it up with additional street trees, etc.

Chair Neff reopened Public hearing 9:20 pm to take public comment on the discussion.

Peter Cowley, Starr Street, Loma Linda expressed concerns on the density of the project and the parking issues.

A discussion commenced about changes to the conditions of approval.

Commissioner Rosenbaum voiced her views in regards to small lot subdivision projects. She stated that the Commission had agreed to this type of development because the developers and builders were providing amenities that otherwise the City would not have. She continued to say that other tracts that were approved put in amenities such as a swimming pool, several parks, and tot lots, and BBQ pits. Ms. Rosenbaum stated that, in her opinion, this project was not providing any of those amenities, only a 5-acre of open space.

Mr. Elssmann interjected that he agreed with Commissioner Rosenbaum, but that the orientation of the property and the easement had not allow us to be more creative.

Commissioner Rosenbaum stated that she had no issue with lot sizes or density. She stated that the project supported what the Planning Commission had asked for, but the open space that this project has could not be developed as well as the developer would have liked or give the City the amenities that it expected because the project cannot freely use the open space that they have, the 5 acres in the Edison easement, therefore cannot provide the amenities the Planning Commission had envisioned, i.e. larger green spaces where people can gather.

Commissioner Rosenbaum stated that when the Commission started down this path she did not recall any specifications about restricting this as unusable open space.

Chair Neff suggested that if there was a concern about the access to the landscaped area, the developer might consider adding another pathway can be made for easier access.

Commissioner Patel stated that the park amenities were not there. Commissioner Rosenbaum concurred with Commissioner Patel that this project was not providing their idea of open space and the amenities similar to what the Ryland Homes tract had to offer. Because this project was not free to put whatever they want in this easement because it's someone else's easement.

Chair Neff stated that in his opinion a park scenario was far better than a loud noisy poolside. Commissioner Rosenbaum reiterated that this project was not free to put whatever they want in this easement because it's someone else's easement. She continued to say that the Commission needed to clarify and define a policy that expressed what the City was expecting from small lot subdivisions.

Chair Neff stated that his preference sided with green scenery that almost resembled a golf course and that it was something very pleasing. He continued to ask staff if they had discussed amenities for this type of tract. Director Woldruff explained that the General Plan, the existing General Plan, had mandated in the Parks Element for 10 or more years, a goal of the City to develop the Edison easement as a walking trail and park, and that her thought was that the City was getting exactly what it had been asking for at no cost to the City. She added that she was of the same mind as Mayor Gaio Hansberger saying the it was quite enjoyable to be able to get out and walk a long distance and never have to really deal with traffic. Chair Neff suggested that this was a unique situation and that the City had benefited from improving a large green belt that will greatly enhance the City.

Mr. Elssmann stated the he appreciated Commissioner Rosenbaum comments. He continued to say that the Planning Commission would be interested in the fact that all new subdivisions coming to Mission Road, including Mission Trails tract, which is the Ryland Homes, the project now before for review, Mission Lane, and a third project, called Mission Creek, which would be submitted in the very near future would combine all of the amenities that Commissioner

Rosenbaum was looking for i.e., a community pool, open space, basketball courts and tot lots in the Ryland Homes Tract, a 5-acre open space in the tract before you and tennis courts, volleyball courts, putting fields, a water element, half-court basketball courts added to that would be trail connectivity

Commissioner Christianson asked Mr. Elssmann if all three projects, Mission Trails at Ryland Homes, Mission Lane and Mission Creek would be accessible throughout the three projects and would be for public use. Ms. Lamson stated that it had been staff's intent that all three projects be connected.

Mr. Elssmann added that he wanted to share with the Commission the fact that he had had the opportunity to plan the whole region along with John Goodman for engineering, and American Pacific Homes, and to reassure the Planning Commission that they embraced the goals and principles that the commission had developed.

Director Woldruff explained to the Commission that most of the amenities included in the three projects were usable by everyone, except for the pool in Mission Trails Tract and added that what one project was lacking would be found in the others, and all within walking distance. Ms. Lamson added that the distance between Pepper and California was less than one mile.

Commissioner Patel suggested that if three or four homes were removed to provide areas for pocket parks and other amenities such as BBQ pits, and a little greenery added in different places would enhance the project both architecturally and esthetically.

Mr. Elssmann reminded the Planning Commission that one of the concepts that was iterated by Dan Burton was that amenities needed to be close by and stated that the 5-acre park was a 60-second walk away. He added that he would further explore to find a way to add some of those BBQs and amenities.

Commissioner Christianson wanted to know how the project would address the concerns of those individuals on Pepper Way that indicated that their views would be drastically altered by the building heights.

Senior Planner Lamson addressed the issue and stated that there was no protected view shed in that location. She added that there was no guarantee that the view would be maintained for those property owners on Pepper Way and that those property owners had development rights as well.

Chair Neff added that the homes had wrap-around from the entrance to the homes and were side loaded, which can add additional enhancements. Mr. Elssmann explained that others would see the sides of the upstairs because of the varied setbacks and the way that the homes and footprints were designed particularly on the corners units would add some enhancement.

Senior Planner Lamson added comments to the view shed issue stating that there are areas in some communities, more specifically ocean front communities, that have view sheds that are protected, but that Loma Linda does not have any of those types of protected view sheds. She added that the land was very flat in that area.

Chair Neff directed staff to continue to work with the developer as far as adding additional landscaping or something that would provide some relief to the linearity of the road without making major change.

Motion by Rosenbaum, seconded by Patel, and carried by a vote of 3-1, Christianson opposed, to recommend to the City Council to Adopt the Mitigated Negative Declaration as modified, Approve and adopt Zone Change No. 03-06, based on the Findings, Approve the Development Agreement, Approve Tentative Tract Map No. 16323 submitted on May 5, 2004 based on the Findings, and subject to the attached modified Conditions of Approval.

CONTINUED ITEMS

PUBLIC HEARING

PC-04-27 - GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROJECT - The project is a comprehensive update to the City's General Plan, which was originally adopted in 1973. A Draft General Plan document has been prepared based on public input received in various public workshops over the past two years. The draft document has been designed to respond to and reflect the City's changing conditions and community goals in order to guide the City's development during the next twenty years. The project boundaries include all of the City's corporate limits and the Sphere of Influence in the San Bernardino County unincorporated areas generally located south of Redlands Boulevard, east of California Street, south of Barton Road and west of the San Timoteo Creek Channel, and the southeast portion of the South Hills area into San Timoteo Canyon and south to the Riverside County line. The Draft General Plan document addresses issues and sets broad policies related to Land Use, Community Design, Circulation, Economic Development, Housing, Conservation, Open Space, Noise, Safety, Public Services and Facilities, and Historic Preservation.

Chair Neff recommended that the review of the Draft General Plan be continued to the Special meeting of May 19, 2004.

Director Woldruff reminded the Commissioners that the Draft Environmental Impact Report was advertised to have a public hearing on May 19, 2004.

Commissioner Rosenbaum asked which issue needed to be addressed at the May 19, 2004 meeting and Director Woldruff explained that it was the Draft Environmental Impact Report and the other items that are still pending on the Draft General Plan itself are the Housing Element and the Implementation Programs, and the Hillside Mixed-use proposal. She added that she would like to dedicate the entire meeting on May 19, 2004 to the General Plan and try to get through the Environment Impact Report, which is the remaining section and forward it to City Council.

PC-04-28 - APPROVAL OF MINUTES – Minutes of the Special meeting of January 14, 2004, the Minutes of the Regular meeting of February 4, 2004, and the Agenda Summary of the Joint city Council and Planning Commission General Plan Workshop of April 19, 2004.

There were no revisions to the above referenced minutes.

Motion by Christianson, seconded by Patel, and unanimously carried to approve the Minutes of the Special meeting of January 14, 2004, the Minutes of the Regular meeting of February 4, 2004, and the Agenda Summary of the Joint city Council and Planning Commission General Plan Workshop of April 19, 2004, as presented by staff. (Essex absent)

REPORTS BY THE PLANNING COMMISSIONERS

There were no reports by the Planning Commissioners.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR REPORT

Director Woldruff deferred her report to another meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Christianson, seconded by Patel, and unanimously carried to adjourn to a special meeting on May 19, 2004. (Essex absent)

The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m.

Minutes approved at the special meeting of June 9, 2004

Administrative Secretary

I:\PlanningCom (PC)\PC 2004\04May05M-draft.doc

Attachment F

Planned Community Document

Mission Lane

TTM 16323

Project Description

Mission Lane is a 95 single-family home project on 15 acres of land. The project is located in a medium density General Plan designation of 5-10 units per acre and is requesting a Planned Community Zoning Designation. Density on this project will be 6.5 units/acre thereby complying with the General Plan Land Use designation. This small lot community will contain 5.5 acres of landscaped open space. It will include an 11,782 square foot central neighborhood park. In addition, a central linear park will run south from Van Leuven Street to the creek. It will be over 13,000 square feet. Lots will range in size from 2,104 square feet to 3,843 square feet with an average of 2,616 square feet.

Architecture forward homes, that have singlewide garages, will present a rich texture to the park like community. Pedestrian linkages will tie into the construction of the regional trails system that will meander along the city's backbone north/south trail along the Edison Power line corridor.

Project Location

This community is located on land that is on the south side of Mission Road west of the Edison Powerline easement, the east side of Pepper Avenue and the north and south side of the extension of Van Leuven Street in Loma Linda. The Monterey Pines Apartments and Mountain View condominiums border the west side of the project.

Project Goals

Mission Lane is a neo-traditional neighborhood that incorporates the principles of a livable walkable neighborhood with proper design and amenities that expand on the themes of Mission Trails. Mission Lane will act as transition between the higher density apartments and condominiums to the west and the lower density Mission Trails to the east. Mission Lane balances a neighborhood of medium density with an overabundance of open space and amenities. Long-term viability of the neighborhood is maintained through a Homeowners Association.

Mission Lane is being created to fill an increasingly narrow niche in the marketplace, first time buyers, seniors, young and single-parent households. These buyers struggle to find new housing that they can afford close to their work in Loma Linda. In addition, these buyers don't have the time or desire to provide the necessary upkeep for their yards.

Project Objectives

In keeping with the goals of a neo-traditional community Mission Lane is designed to have the following features to achieve these goals:

- Pedestrian linkages, trails, parks and open space within 800 feet of all homes, low speed/green streets, access to mass transit, places for gathering and interaction.

- Mechanism for long term care and maintenance of this neighborhood also will occur.

- Embracing the Mission District Heritage through rich architecture and embracing citrus heritage.

- **Walkable Community-** accesses to the community trails are strategically placed through out the neighborhood.
- **Pedestrian Linkages-**several key areas have pedestrian paths to allow travel to the neighborhood parks, regional trails systems and adjoining communities. All homes are within 800 feet of the significant open space areas.
- **Trails-**along the Edison easement, Memory lane will install a 1/4 of a mile walking trail linking to the pedestrian bridge that will connect to the south side of the San Timoteo Creek Flood Control channel. This will give residences of the Mission District direct access to this regional trail without having to face significant vehicular conflict with car at Mountain View Avenue.
- **Parks-**Nearly 5.5 acres of parks and open space will be developed as part of this project. Types of planned amenities include large areas for turf, for active play, tot lot, picnic and barbecue areas. A Citrus and Avocado grove along with a community park as well as other formal planting will be part of the landscape pallet;
- **Low Speed/Green Streets-** Varieties of street widths are proposed to allow parking on both sides for two-way streets B, C & G. Parking on one side for one way streets are proposed for streets D, E, & F. Street A provides a one way street that loops around a 25-foot central linear park. Parking for street A is provided in the designated parking spaces that are provided along this central parkway. These designs will not only provide a significant means of calming traffic within the neighborhood; they will create very meaningful and purposeful spaces for the members of the community.
- **Access to Mass Transit-** Mission Lane is located close to the Omnibus stop located on Mountain View Avenue. Further, bus stops could be place along Van Leuven, near the regional pedestrian trail.
- **HOA-** A Homeowners Association is planned for this neighborhood in order to maintain the parks, trails, street trees, streets and recreational facilities. Enforcement of the CC&R's will also occur in order to insure long-term quality of the neighborhood.
- **Mission District-** Mission Lane will plant hundreds of new citrus trees as part of this project. Architecture will be varied and rich to include a variety of styles that are consistent with the Mission District Overlay Guides lines.

Development Standards

- Minimum lot size is 2,100 square feet
- Minimum lot width is 32 feet
- Minimum lot depth is 66 feet
- Front yard set back is a minimum of 5 feet
- Rear yard set back is a minimum of 10 feet
- Side yard set back shall be a minimum of 3 feet
- Zero lot lines shall be allowed within the neighborhood.
- Reciprocal use easements will be permitted on the side yards.
- Maximum building height shall be 30 feet
- Two story plans may have two bedrooms with a two car tandem garage or a two-car split garage.
- All garages shall be not wider that one car width.
- Final project will submit a Precise Plan of Design Package